

Mr. ROTH. Let me make—I do not want to interrupt.

Mr. WARNER. No. Please go ahead.

Mr. ROTH. Let me point out those findings were general findings. But the fact is, the up-to-date intelligence that Washington had in the days immediately before Pearl Harbor was not made available to General Short or Admiral Kimmel.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, that sum portion of intelligence, I think that all throughout history has been conceded. And these tribunals, particularly the Congress, had that before it. It is for that reason maybe they were not court-martialed and incarcerated, if found guilty.

Mr. ROTH. Yes, you knew an air carrier attack was possible. But to know, for example, as they knew in Washington in the days right before the attack that the Japanese wanted to know where the warships were located, it was this kind of information that gave immediacy to the threat. To me, that was critical.

You talk about the Dorn Report. Let me just say, as part of the Dorn Report, they sort of are all over the map in their finding. They say:

It is clear today, as should have been clear since 1946 to any serious reader of the JCC hearing record, that Admiral Kimmel and General Short were not solely responsible for the defeat at Pearl Harbor.

* * * more information was available in Washington but not forwarded to them. Army and Navy officials in Washington were privy to intercepted Japanese diplomatic communications (notably the "bomb plot", "winds", "pilot", and "fourteen-part" messages) which provided crucial—

Now, this is the Dorn report—

which provided crucial confirmation of the imminence of war. Read together and with the leisure, focus, and clarity of hindsight, these messages point strongly towards an attack on Pearl Harbor at dawn on the 7th.

That is the Dorn Report:

The immediacy of an attack on Pearl Harbor at dawn on the 7th.

The evidence of the handling of these messages in Washington reveals some ineptitude, some unwarranted assumptions and misstatements, limited coordination, ambiguous language and lack of clarification and followup at higher levels.

I could go on.

A careful reading of the proceedings and reports of those panels suggests clear recognition of the faults at all levels. Yet these two gentlemen were singled out and were not given advance to their wartime rating.

I think it was inequitable. I think it was not fair, and it seems to me the greatness of this country is that we can go back and make changes where warranted.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I have just located, I think, a document that interests me a great deal. It is entitled, "Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack: Report of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Har-

bor Attack," pursuant to a resolution of Congress, S. Res. 27. And it was reported on July 5, 1946.

Just listen to those Senators who were on this commission: Alben Barkley, you remember him. What an extraordinary man; Walter George, George was considered one of the great, great internationalists; Scott Lucas of Illinois, one of the most senior Senators from the State of Illinois, the Presiding Officer's State; Owen Brewster from Maine; Homer Ferguson from Michigan.

I say to my good friend, those names still reverberate with absolute distinction and credibility in this Chamber today. They made the findings which left history intact. And we here, just the two of us, really, on the floor tonight, are to urge our colleagues tomorrow to reverse that history?

With all due respect, there is not the foundation, in my judgment, for the Senate to so act and overrule the findings of these men.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, I have the greatest respect for his soundness of judgment, for his honesty and integrity. I have the same for the Senators named. But the fact remains, honorable men and women often disagree. Here we do disagree.

I am just trying to join my colleagues—there are 23 of us—in seeking to correct what we think was unfair treatment to two individuals who devoted a lifetime of service to this country. Yes, there are differences of opinion on this matter, but nothing seems to me more important than to try to correct a record which I think, on the basis of the studies I have seen, results in unfairness. We are trying to correct that.

I understand you disagree with the basis of our proposal, but I think both of us want the same thing, and that is fairness.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, there is no one in this body for whom I have greater respect than my dear friend and colleague, Senator ROTH. He has put a lot of work, together with his able staff, into this case. But it seems to me that we stand in a momentous hour in the history of this country. We are asking our colleagues to trust in our own judgments and our findings as to whether or not one of the most remarkable and tragic chapters in the history of this Nation, in effect, should have this significant reversal these many years hence, based on no new evidence, based on the fervent plea of my colleagues, Senator ROTH and Senator THURMOND.

I shall take the floor tomorrow and most vigorously oppose this. I think for the night we have pretty well concluded this debate. I have to tell the Senator, it is an interesting one for me and not altogether without some implications in my own life, thinking back in that period of history. I will never forget Pearl Harbor.

If I could just reminisce for a moment, it is hard to believe that shortly thereafter this city, the Nation's Capital, endured periods of blackout. I remember it very well, as a small—well, I wasn't so small. I remember my father was a physician and he was able to drive at night only with a slit on the headlights to get to the hospital. I remember very well our home was equipped with blackout curtains. All the streetlights went out. We were fearful of an attack here in Washington, DC, and, indeed, other east coast cities. There were Nazi submarines patrolling off the east coast of the United States, sinking ships.

How well I recall on the beaches of Virginia there was washed up debris from sunken ships. The people on the west coast lived in constant fear that there would be an invasion. These were serious and strenuous times, calling on the men and women of the Armed Forces for a duty and a commitment and an assumption of risk without parallel, because this Nation in many respects was unprepared. How well we recall the pictures of the Army practicing maneuvers with broomsticks rather than rifles.

When I think of the tragic death, loss of life and property, indeed, if we were to follow your logic—President Roosevelt had that intelligence—we could go back and judge the record of many others. It seems to me that what is before the Senate tonight is clear facts that men and women of clear conscience, with the ability to assess fresh information, have painstakingly gone through it, reached their conclusion year after year, and then a President, Harry Truman, is my recollection, am I correct, made the decision that he did with respect to these two officers.

I just do not believe that the Senate at this time should reverse that history.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, May 21, 1999, the federal debt stood at \$5,596,857,521,196.34 (Five trillion, five hundred ninety-six billion, eight hundred fifty-seven million, five hundred twenty-one thousand, one hundred ninety-six dollars and thirty-four cents).

One year ago, May 21, 1998, the federal debt stood at \$5,503,780,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred three billion, seven hundred eighty million).

Fifteen years ago, May 21, 1984, the federal debt stood at \$1,485,189,000,000 (One trillion, four hundred eighty-five billion, one hundred eighty-nine million).

Twenty-five years ago, May 21, 1974, the federal debt stood at \$470,357,000,000 (Four hundred seventy billion, three hundred fifty-seven million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,126,500,521,196.34 (Five trillion, one hundred twenty-six billion, five hundred million, five hundred twenty-one thousand, one hundred ninety-six dollars and thirty-four cents) during the past 25 years.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting a withdrawal and sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION "EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE FOR ALL CHILDREN ACT OF 1999"—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT—PM 30

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 1999, the Secretary of the Senate on May 21, 1999, during the adjournment of the Senate, received the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit for your immediate consideration the "Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999," my Administration's proposal for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and other elementary and secondary education programs.

My proposal builds on the positive trends achieved under current law. The "Improving America's Schools Act of 1994," which reauthorized the ESEA 5 years ago, and the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act" gave States and school districts a framework for integrating Federal resources in support of State and local reforms based on high academic standards. In response, 48 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have adopted State-level standards. Recent results of the National Assessment of Educational Progress

(NAEP) show improved performance for the economically disadvantaged and other at-risk students who are the primary focus of ESEA programs. NAEP reading scores for 9-year-olds in high-poverty schools have improved significantly since 1992, while mathematics achievement has also increased nationally. Students in high-poverty schools and the lowest-performing students—the specific target populations for the ESEA Title I program—have registered gains in both reading and math achievement.

I am encouraged by these positive trends, but educational results for many children remain far below what they should be. My proposal to reauthorize the ESEA is based on four themes reflecting lessons from research and the experience of implementing the 1994 Act.

First, we would continue to focus on high academic standards for all children. The underlying purpose of every program within the ESEA is to help all children reach challenging State and local academic standards. States have largely completed the first stage of standards-based reform by developing content standards for all children. My bill would support the next stage of reform by helping States, school districts, schools, and teachers use these standards to guide classroom instruction and assessment.

My proposal for reauthorizing Title I, for example, would require States to hold school districts and schools accountable for student performance against State standards, including helping the lowest-performing students continually to improve. The bill also would continue to target Federal elementary and secondary education resources on those students furthest from meeting State and local standards, with a particular emphasis on narrowing the gap in achievement between disadvantaged students and their more affluent peers. In this regard, my proposal would phase in equal treatment of Puerto Rico in ESEA funding formulas, so that poor children in Puerto Rico are treated similarly to those in the rest of the country for the purpose of formula allocations.

Second, my proposal responds to research showing that while qualified teachers are critical to improving student achievement, far too many teachers are not prepared to teach to high standards. Teacher quality is a particular problem in high-poverty schools, and the problem is often exacerbated by the use of paraprofessionals in instructional roles.

My bill addresses teacher quality by holding States accountable for stronger enforcement of their own certification and licensure requirements, while at the same time providing substantial support for State and local professional development efforts. The Teaching to High Standards initiative

in Title II would help move challenging educational standards into every classroom by providing teachers with sustained and intensive high-quality professional development in core academic subjects, supporting new teachers during their first 3 years in the classroom, and ensuring that all teachers are proficient in relevant content knowledge and teaching skills.

The Technology for Education initiative under Title III would expand the availability of educational technology as a tool to help teachers implement high standards in the classroom, particularly in high-poverty schools. My bill also would extend, over the next 7 years, the Class-Size Reduction initiative, which aims to reduce class sizes in the early grades by helping districts to hire and train 100,000 teachers. And the Title VII Bilingual Education proposal would help ensure that all teachers are well trained to teach students with limited English proficiency, who are found in more and more classrooms with each passing year.

Third, my bill would increase support for safe, healthy, disciplined, and drug-free learning environments where all children feel connected, motivated, and challenged to learn and where parents are welcomed and involved. The recent tragedy at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, reminds us that we must be ever vigilant against the risks of violence and other dangerous behaviors in our schools. Our reauthorization bill includes several measures to help mitigate these risks.

We would strengthen the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act by concentrating funds on districts with the greatest need for drug- and violence-prevention programs, and by emphasizing the use of research-based programs of proven effectiveness. Moreover, with respect to students who bring weapons to school, this proposal would require schools to refer such students to a mental health professional for assessment and require counseling for those who pose an imminent threat to themselves or others; allow funding for programs that educate students about the risks associated with guns; expand character education programs; and promote alternative schools and second chance programs. A new School Emergency Response to Violence program would provide rapid assistance to school districts that have experienced violence or other trauma that disrupts the learning environment.

My High School Reform initiative would support innovative reforms to improve student achievement in high schools, such as expanding the connections between adults and students that are necessary for effective learning and healthy personal development. This new initiative would provide resources to help transform 5,000 high schools into places where students receive individual attention, are motivated to